

Kane Moon (SBN 249834)
kane.moon@moonyanglaw.com
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan (SBN 320389)
lilit@moonyanglaw.com
MOON & YANG, APC
1055 W. Seventh St., Suite 1880
Los Angeles, California 90017
Telephone: (213) 232-3128
Facsimile: (213) 232-3125

Attorneys for Plaintiff Cesar Rodelas

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

CESAR RODELAS, individually, and on behalf
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

vs.

BAGATELOS GLASS SYSTEMS, INC., a
California corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,
inclusive,

Defendants

Case No.: 34-2021-00308023

**FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE
ACTION COMPLAINT:**

1. Civil Penalties Under PAGA [Cal. Lab.
Code § 2699, et seq.].

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
THE PARTIES	3
A. Plaintiff.....	3
B. Defendants.....	3
ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION	4
FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	8
PRAYER FOR RELIEF	10
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	Error! Bookmark not defined.

1 Plaintiff Cesar Rodelas (“Plaintiff”), based upon facts that either have evidentiary support
2 or are likely to have evidentiary support after a reasonable opportunity for further investigation
3 and discovery, alleges as follows:

4 **INTRODUCTION & PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

5 1. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants Bagatelos Glass Systems, Inc. and
6 Does 1 through 10 (collectively referred to as “Defendants”) for California Labor Code
7 violations and unfair business practices stemming from Defendants’ failure to pay minimum
8 wages, failure to pay overtime wages, failure to provide meal periods, failure to authorize and
9 permit rest periods, failure to maintain accurate records of hours worked and meal periods,
10 failure to timely pay all wages to terminated employees, failure to indemnify necessary business
11 expenses, and failure to furnish accurate wage statements.

12 2. For over 50 years, California’s courts and legislature have recognized that this
13 State’s wage-and-hour laws serve a compelling public interest of fostering a stable job market.
14 Wages are not ordinary debts. Because of the economic position of the average worker and his
15 or her family, it is essential to the public welfare that employers obey the wage-and-hour laws so
16 that employees are promptly paid the minimum/overtime wages that the Legislature has required
17 for employees. So fundamental are California’s wage-and-hour laws that the Legislature has
18 criminalized certain types of violations. In extending extra protection to deter violations of these
19 underlying statutes—since Plaintiff is not seeking general and/or special damages, restitution or
20 other damages other than civil penalties—California has enacted the PAGA to permit an
21 individual to bring an action for PAGA penalties only, which is the precise and sole nature of this
22 action.

23 3. All non-exempt California employees of Defendants beginning September 16, 2020
24 to the present, are “Aggrieved Employees.”

25 4. Plaintiff brings this action against Defendants seeking only to recover penalties on
26 behalf of all Aggrieved Employees that worked for Defendants, and on behalf of the State of
27 California. Plaintiff does not seek to recover anything other than penalties as permitted by
28 California Labor Code Section 2699 at this time. To the extent that statutory violations are

mentioned for wage violations, Plaintiff does not seek underlying general and/or special damages for those violations, but simply penalties as permitted by California Labor Code Section 2699, declaratory relief, and injunctive relief for himself, and all aggrieved employees as permitted by the PAGA.

5. Defendants own/owned and operate/operated an industry, business, and establishment within the State of California, including Sacramento County. As such, and based upon all the facts and circumstances incident to Defendants' business in California, Defendants are subject to the California Labor Code, Wage Orders issued by the Industrial Welfare Commission ("IWC"), and the California Business & Professions Code.

6. Despite these requirements, throughout the statutory period Defendants maintained a systematic, company-wide policy and practice of:

- (a) Failing to pay employees for all hours worked, including all minimum wages, and overtime wages in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders;
- (b) Failing to provide employees with timely and duty-free meal periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, failing to maintain accurate records of all meal periods taken or missed, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a meal period violation occurred;
- (c) Failing to authorize and permit employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods in compliance with the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders, and failing to pay an additional hour's pay for each workday a rest period violation occurred;
- (d) Failing to indemnify employees for necessary business expenses incurred;
- (e) Willfully failing to pay employees all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium wages due within the time period specified by California law when employment terminates; and

- (f) Failing to maintain accurate records of the hours that employees worked.
- (g) Failing to provide employees with accurate, itemized wage statements containing all the information required by the California Labor Code and IWC Wage Orders.

7. On information and belief, Defendants, and each of them were on actual and constructive notice of the improprieties alleged herein and intentionally refused to rectify their unlawful policies. Defendants' violations, as alleged above, during all relevant times herein were willful and deliberate.

8. At all relevant times, Defendants were and are legally responsible for all of the unlawful conduct, policies, practices, acts and omissions as described in each and all of the foregoing paragraphs as the employer of Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees. Further, Defendants are responsible for each of the unlawful acts or omissions complained of herein under the doctrine of "respondeat superior".

THE PARTIES

A. Plaintiff

9. Plaintiff is a California resident that worked for Defendants in the County of Sacramento, State of California, as a glazier from approximately August 2020 to December 2020.

10. Plaintiff reserves the right to seek leave to amend this complaint to add new plaintiffs, if necessary, in order to establish suitable representative(s) pursuant to *La Sala v. American Savings and Loan Association* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 864, 872, and other applicable law.

B. Defendants

11. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based upon that information and belief alleges, that Defendant Bagatelos Glass Systems, Inc. is:

- (a) A California corporation with its principal place of business in Sacramento, California.
- (b) A business entity conducting business in numerous counties throughout the State of California, including in Sacramento County; and
- (c) The former employer of Plaintiff, and the current and/or former Aggrieved

Employees. Bagatelos Glass Systems, Inc. suffered and permitted Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work, and/or controlled their wages, hours, or working conditions.

12. Plaintiff does not currently know the true names or capacities of the persons or entities sued herein as Does 1-10, inclusive, and therefore sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Each of the Doe Defendants was in some manner legally responsible for the damages suffered by Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees as alleged herein. Plaintiff will amend this complaint to set forth the true names and capacities of these Defendants when they have been ascertained, together with appropriate charging allegations, as may be necessary.

13. At all times mentioned herein, the Defendants named as Does 1-10, inclusive, and each of them, were residents of, doing business in, availed themselves of the jurisdiction of, and/or injured a significant number of the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in the State of California.

14. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that at all relevant times each Defendant, directly or indirectly, or through agents or other persons, employed Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees, and exercised control over their wages, hours, and working conditions. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that, at all relevant times, each Defendant was the principal, agent, partner, joint venturer, officer, director, controlling shareholder, subsidiary, affiliate, parent corporation, successor in interest and/or predecessor in interest of some or all of the other Defendants, and was engaged with some or all of the other Defendants in a joint enterprise for profit, and bore such other relationships to some or all of the other Defendants so as to be liable for their conduct with respect to the matters alleged below. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each Defendant acted pursuant to and within the scope of the relationships alleged above, that each Defendant knew or should have known about, and authorized, ratified, adopted, approved, controlled, aided and abetted the conduct of all other Defendants.

ALLEGATIONS COMMON TO ALL CAUSES OF ACTION

15. Plaintiff is a California resident who worked for Defendants in the County of

1 Sacramento, State of California, as a glazier from approximately August 2020 to December 2020.
2 During the statutory period, Defendants classified Plaintiff as non-exempt from California's
3 overtime requirements, and paid Plaintiff an hourly wage.

4 16. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to pay Plaintiff for all hours
5 worked (including minimum wages and overtime wages), failed to provide Plaintiff with
6 uninterrupted meal periods, failed to authorize and permit Plaintiff to take uninterrupted rest
7 periods, failed to indemnify Plaintiff for necessary business expenses, failed to timely pay all
8 final wages to Plaintiff when Defendants terminated Plaintiff's employment, and failed to furnish
9 accurate wage statements to Plaintiff. As discussed below, Plaintiff's experience working for
10 Defendants was typical and illustrative.

11 17. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants maintained a policy and practice of
12 not paying Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees for all hours worked, including all overtime
13 wages. Defendants regularly use a system of time rounding in a manner that resulted, over a
14 period of time, in failing to compensate Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees properly for all
15 the time they have actually worked, even though the realities of Defendants' operations are such
16 that it is possible, practical, and feasible to count and pay for work time to the minute. Also
17 throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees received shift
18 differentials, hazard pay, and other remuneration. However, Defendants failed to incorporate all
19 remuneration when calculating the correct overtime and double-time rate of pay, leading to
20 underpayment of overtime and double-time to Plaintiff and the the Aggrieved Employees. Also
21 throughout the statutory period, Plaintiff and the the Aggrieved Employees were required to
22 work off-the-clock, which included pre-clock-in activities, such as waiting in line in order to
23 clock in and in order to undergo a COVID screening, which included a temperature check and a
24 questionnaire, all off-the-clock and uncompensated. Additionally, "Hazard Pay" was listed on the
25 wage statement, but no hours or rates were provided to go along with this type of pay. Finally,
26 meal periods were automatically deducted, despite the fact that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
27 Employees did not always receive full uninterrupted meal periods, leading to underpayment of
28 wages. In maintaining a practice of not paying all wages owed, Defendants failed to maintain

1 accurate records of the hours Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees worked.

2 18. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to provide
3 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees with legally compliant meal periods. Defendants
4 sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work in excess of
5 five consecutive hours a day without providing 30-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, duty-
6 free meal period for every five hours of work, or without compensating Plaintiff and the
7 Aggrieved Employees for meal periods that were not provided by the end of the fifth hour of
8 work or tenth hour of work. Defendants also did not adequately inform Plaintiff and the
9 Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a meal period by the end of the fifth hour of work, or,
10 for shifts greater than 10 hours, by the end of the tenth hour of work. Also, Defendants
11 maintained a practice of automatically deducting meal periods from Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
12 Employees' timesheets, despite the fact that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees did not
13 always receive full uninterrupted meal periods, leading to underpayment of wages to Plaintiff
14 and the Aggrieved Employees. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not provide
15 meal periods to Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees in compliance with California law.

16 19. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants have wrongfully failed to authorize
17 and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take timely and duty-free rest periods.
18 Defendants sometimes, but not always, required Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to work
19 in excess of four consecutive hours a day without Defendants authorizing and permitting them to
20 take a 10-minute, continuous and uninterrupted, rest period for every four hours of work (or
21 major fraction of four hours), or without compensating Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees
22 for rest periods that were not authorized or permitted. Defendants also did not adequately inform
23 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees of their right to take a rest period. Moreover, Defendants
24 did not have adequate policies or practices permitting or authorizing rest periods for Plaintiff and
25 the Aggrieved Employees, nor did Defendants have adequate policies or practices regarding the
26 timing of rest periods. Defendants also did not have adequate policies or practices to verify
27 whether Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were taking their required rest periods. Further,
28 Defendants did not maintain accurate records of employee work periods, and therefore

1 Defendants cannot demonstrate that Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees took rest periods
2 during the middle of each work period. Accordingly, Defendants' policy and practice was to not
3 authorize and permit Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees to take rest periods in compliance
4 with California law.

5 20. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants wrongfully required Plaintiff and the
6 Aggrieved Employees to pay expenses that they incurred in direct discharge of their duties for
7 Defendants without reimbursement. For example, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were
8 required to use their own personal cellular telephones for work to communicate with other
9 employees regarding work, without reimbursement.

10 21. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants willfully failed and refused to timely
11 pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees at the conclusion of their employment all wages for
12 all minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest period premium
13 wages. Further, Defendants did not pay Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees their final
14 paychecks immediately upon termination.

15 22. Throughout the statutory period, Defendants failed to furnish Plaintiff and the
16 Aggrieved Employees with accurate, itemized wage statements showing all applicable hourly
17 rates, and all gross and net wages earned (including correct hours worked, correct wages earned
18 for hours worked, correct overtime hours worked, correct wages for meal periods that were not
19 provided in accordance with California law, correct wages for rest periods that were not
20 authorized and permitted to take in accordance with California law, and Defendant's address).
21 Further, the wage statements do not show Defendant's address as required by California law. As
22 a result of these violations of California Labor Code § 226(a), the Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
23 Employees suffered injury because, among other things:

- 24 (a) the violations led them to believe that they were not entitled to be paid
25 minimum wages, overtime wages, meal period premium wages, and rest
26 period premium wages to which they were entitled, even though they were
27 entitled;
- 28 (b) the violations led them to believe that they had been paid the minimum,

overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages, even though they had not been;

- (c) the violations led them to believe they were not entitled to be paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they were;
- (d) the violations led them to believe they had been paid minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium wages at the correct California rate even though they had not been;
- (e) the violations hindered them from determining the amounts of minimum, overtime, meal period premium, and rest period premium owed to them;
- (f) in connection with their employment before and during this action, and in connection with prosecuting this action, the violations caused them to have to perform mathematical computations to determine the amounts of wages owed to them, computations they would not have to make if the wage statements contained the required accurate information;
- (g) by understating the wages truly due them, the violations caused them to lose entitlement and/or accrual of the full amount of Social Security, disability, unemployment, and other governmental benefits;
- (h) the wage statements inaccurately understated the wages, hours, and wages rates to which Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were entitled, and Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees were paid less than the wages and wage rates to which they were entitled.

Thus, Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees are owed the amounts provided for in California Labor Code § 226(e), including actual damages.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

(Against all Defendants for Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, Cal. Lab. Code § 2698 et seq.)

23. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and re-alleges as if fully stated herein

1 paragraphs 1 through 22 in this First Amended Complaint.

2 24. At all times herein mentioned, Defendants were subject to the Labor Code of the
3 State of California and the applicable Industrial Welfare Commission Orders.

4 25. California Labor Code § 2699(a) specifically provides for a private right of action
5 to recover penalties for violations of the Labor Code: “Notwithstanding any other provision of
6 law, any provision of this code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed and collected by
7 the Labor and Workforce Development Agency or any of its departments, divisions,
8 commissions, boards, agencies, or employees, for a violation of this code, may, as an alternative,
9 be recovered through a civil action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or
10 herself and other current or former employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Section
11 2699.3.”

12 26. Plaintiff has exhausted his administrative remedies pursuant to California Labor
13 Code § 2699.3. On September 13, 2021, Plaintiff gave written notice by online filing to the
14 Labor and Workforce Development Agency and by certified mail to Defendants of the specific
15 provisions of the Labor Code that Defendants have violated against Plaintiff and current and
16 former aggrieved employees, including the facts and theories to support the violations. At the
17 time of this filing, 65 days has elapsed since Plaintiff provided notice, but the Labor and
18 Workforce Development Agency has not indicated that it intends to investigate Defendants’
19 Labor Code violations discussed in the notice. Accordingly, Plaintiff may commence a civil
20 action to recover penalties under Labor Code § 2699 pursuant to § 2699.3 for the violations of
21 the Labor Code described in this Complaint. These penalties include, but are not limited to,
22 penalties under California Labor Code §§ 210, 226.3, 558, 1197.1, and 2699(f)(2).

23 27. In addition, Plaintiff seeks penalties for Defendants’ violation of California
24 Labor Code § 1174(d). Pursuant to California Labor Code § 1174.5, any person, including any
25 entity, employing labor who willfully fails to maintain accurate and complete records required by
26 California Labor Code § 1174 is subject to a penalty under § 1174.5. Pursuant to the applicable
27 IWC Order § 7(A)(3), every employer shall keep time records showing when the employee
28 begins and ends each work period. Meal periods, and total hours worked daily shall also be

1 recorded. Additionally, pursuant to the applicable IWC Order § 7(A)(5), every employer shall
2 keep total hours worked in the payroll period and applicable rates of pay.

3 28. During the time period of employment for Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
4 Employees, Defendants failed to maintain records pursuant to the Labor Code and IWC Orders
5 by failing to maintain accurate records showing meal periods, and accurate records showing
6 when employees begin and end each work period. Defendants' failure to provide and maintain
7 records required by the Labor Code IWC Wage Orders deprived Plaintiff and the Aggrieved
8 Employees the ability to know, understand and question the accuracy and frequency of meal
9 periods, and the accuracy of their hours worked stated in Defendants' records. Therefore,
10 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees had no way to dispute the resulting failure to pay wages,
11 all of which resulted in an unjustified economic enrichment to Defendants. As a direct result,
12 Plaintiff and the Aggrieved Employees have suffered and continue to suffer, substantial losses
13 related to the use and enjoyment of such wages, lost interest on such wages and expenses and
14 attorney's fees in seeking to compel Defendants to fully perform its obligation under state law,
15 all to their respective damage in amounts according to proof at trial. Because of Defendants'
16 knowing failure to comply with the Labor Code and applicable IWC Wage Orders, Plaintiff and
17 the Aggrieved Employees have also suffered an injury in that they were prevented from knowing,
18 understanding, and disputing the wage payments paid to them.

19 29. Based on the conduct described in this First Amended Complaint, Plaintiff is
20 entitled to an award of civil penalties on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly
21 Aggrieved Employees of Defendants. The exact amount of the applicable penalties, in all, is in
22 an amount to be shown according to proof at trial. These penalties are in addition to all other
23 remedies permitted by law.

24 30. In addition, Plaintiff seeks an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs
25 pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699(g)(1), which states, "Any employee who prevails in
26 any action shall be entitled to an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs."

27 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

28 Plaintiff, on behalf of himself, the State of California, and similarly Aggrieved

1 Employees, prays for relief and judgment against Defendants, jointly and severally, as follows:

2 As to the First Cause of Action

3 31. That the Court declare, adjudge and decree that Defendants violated the
4 California Labor Code by failing to pay wages for all hours worked (including minimum, and
5 overtime wages), failing to provide meal periods, failing to maintain accurate records of meal
6 periods, failing to authorize and permit rest periods, failing to maintain accurate records of all
7 hours worked and meal periods, failing to indemnify necessary business expenses, failing to pay
8 final wages at termination, and failing to furnish accurate wage statements;

9 32. For all civil penalties pursuant to California Labor Code § 2699, et seq., and all
10 other applicable Labor Code provisions;

11 33. For reasonable attorneys' fees and costs of suit incurred herein pursuant to
12 California Labor Code § 2699;

13 34. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem equitable and appropriate.

14 Respectfully submitted,

15 Dated: March 28, 2022

MOON & YANG, APC

16
17 By: 

Kane Moon
Lilit Ter-Astvatsatryan

18
19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

I am employed in the State of California, County of Los Angeles. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within suit; my business address is 1055 W. 7th Street, Suite 1880, Los Angeles, CA 90017.

On the date indicated below, I served the document described as: **FIRST AMENDED REPRESENTATIVE ACTION COMPLAINT**; on the interested parties in this action by sending [] the original [or] [✓] a true copy thereof [✓] to interested parties as follows [or] [] as stated on the attached service list:

Derek S. Sachs
Anthony C. Ocegüera
LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH LLP
2020 West El Camino Avenue, Suite 700
Sacramento, California 95833
Telephone: (916) 564-5400
Facsimile: (916) 564-5444
derek.sachs@lewisbrisbois.com
anthony.oceguera@lewisbrisbois.com
koreen.janus@lewisbrisbois.com

Attorneys for Defendant Bagatelos Glass Systems, Inc.

[✓] **BY U.S. MAIL:** I deposited such envelope in the mail at Los Angeles, California. The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid. I am “readily familiar” with the firm’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at Los Angeles, California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this **April 21, 2022** at Los Angeles, California.

Ivette Hernandez
Type or Print Name


Signature